Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina Round 10 Part 37

Ali Sina repeatedly claimed that the Quran was not detailed because it did not provide the real identity of person in chapter 111; he wondered about Abu Lahab and claimed that Quran is meaningless without hadith and other storybooks, since they provide much detail about that character. Well, I just proved the Quran, since according to the Quran fanatic disbelievers will never understand the Quran (17:45-46). The believers of the Quran find Abu Lahab (Father of Fire) a universal character. For instance, with his promotion of hate and violence against one fifth of humanity, Ali Sina is an example of prototype Abu Lahab. He is the Father of Fire. He will end up in his own hell together with his supporters who carry fuel for his fire.

These are childish explanations that satisfy only the already convinced. I only quoted two examples, one about Abu Lahab and the other about Job. But there are many other examples where the Quran is not clear unless the sha'ne nozool of those verses are known. A good example of that is the Surah Bara'a that I quoted in page 15 of this debate. For example the Verse 5 of that Sura says when the "**forbidden months** are passed, then fight and slay the Pagans". What are these forbidden months? This is not insignificant. This Sura is instructing Muslims to shed blood. So it is a matter of life and death to know what those forbidden months are. The Quran does not make this clear. Therefore without the tafseer the Quran is incomprehensible. I can bring hundreds of examples like this. No person can make sense of the Quran without the knowledge of the events surrounding it, not even you. That is why in you book, you relied extensively on hadith.

2. Ali Sina frequently makes false claims with hyperbolic pontifications.

For instance, he claimed that verse 7:166 claims that God "literally" transformed Jews to monkeys and pigs and continued by saying that "no scholar has understood them as metaphors." I quoted from Muhammad Asad's translation, The Message, and proved that he was simply wrong.

Another example is his assertion regarding the Quranic verses promoting freedom of religion and expression. He claimed that all belong to Meccan era when Muhammad was weak. The trashy sources he was so fond of using against my faith, yes his favorite sources are reporting differently regarding the first verse in his reference. Thus, he misrepresented his own trashy sources. Verse 2:256 is listed as Medinan verse by the sources he wished me to believe. Again, he mixes truth with falsehood, pieces of glass with diamond, poison with candies… Exactly like hadith narrators and collectors had done.

The verse 7:166 is completely asinine. Of course not all Muslims are dumb. It is natural that some of them see the stupidity of this verse and try to reinterpret it. For example Miraj is an absurdity and many Muslims like Rumi gave “spiritual” meaning to it. Nonetheless the verses about Jews becoming apes are not allegorical. That is why Rumi could not change them even though he was a brilliant man. Some scholars, like you, claim they are allegorical. But the verses are very clear. If these scholars insist that black is white that does not change the truth. There are also scholars that say, the Quran is a tolerant book. Does it make any difference? They are simply lying. Anyone can see the Quran is not a tolerant book just as anyone can see that those verses are not allegorical.

3. Ali Sina has the habit of putting words in his opponent's mouth.

For instance, regarding my promotion of Islamic Reform, he either from ignorance or deliberately switched my words around and described it as Reform in Islam.

I told him to go ask someone who knows English better than him the difference between "Reform in Islam" and "Islamic Reform." He indicated that he has read some of my articles at my website. Has he done so, he should have learned that I do not suggest what he is trying to put in my mouth. Perhaps, he is deliberately trying to misrepresent my position to divert from the main issues. He has somehow succeeded many times by resorting to his favorite silly storybooks, and copying and pasting them here.

I asked you to explain what do you mean by "Islamic Reform". You are beating around the bushes but not answering my simple question. Why instead of accusing me of being dishonest, you just don’t explain what you mean. I asked you a simple question. What does Islamic Reform mean? I understand it as reforming Islam. You say I am ignorant and my

understanding is wrong. So please explain it so even an ignorant person like me can understand.

You are following a pattern of evasion by resorting to ad hominem and introducing red herrings.

4. Ali Sina lacks academic rigor, and when it is in his advantage, he confuses modern Arabic with classic Arabic, or uses third class unreliable sources.

His suggesting MOKAFAT in our debate on Jizya was interesting: After another lengthy diversion with a load of trashy references and lies, he finally made an argument, though a funny argument. First, the word MOKAFAT is modern Arabic and is not used in the Quran and hadith books. He is confusing a Modern Arabic word with classic Arabic.

Ali's linguistic sources are little better than his hadith sources, but they are still third rate sources. He referred to vikipedia.org regarding our discussion on the word Jizya of verse 9:29. Any person can go write an article and definition in wikipedia.org, including him and any of his followers. From his MOKAFAT, his knowledge of classic Arabic became suspect, and from using wikipedia.org, his level of academic gullibility became an issue.

Another example: He criticizes the Quran for being unscientific by reading the verses of the Quran like a third grader. For instance, he refers to verse 18:86 and understand it as "Koran teaches us that the Sun sets in a muddy spring." He ignores the fact the verse is not describing an astronomic event, but the PERCEPTION of Zul Qarnain (the one with two generations), since he verse introduces the perception as "HE FOUND". I urge anyone to search google by putting the following words in quotation "sun set behind" and they will find that more than ten thousand sites, including modern universities astronomy sites "teaches us that the Sun sets" behind the mountains, clouds, trees, etc. If you wish you may search for "sun sets in" OR "sun set in."

We already discussed the word Jizyah and from the text of the verse 9:29 it is clear that this is not something desirable. It says: fight them “until they pay Jizyah with their own hands and they are humiliated”. The word saagher means subdued and humiliated.

حَتَّى يُعْطُواْ الْجِزْيَةَ عَن يَدٍ وَهُمْ صَاغِرُونَ

We have not yet discussed the verse 18:86 or other absurdities of the Quran. This I hope we start doing in our next phase of debate. So far we discussed the incomprehensibility of the Quran and its inhumanity. The absurdities of the Quran require a dedicated discussion.